



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

TP  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,604	10/12/2001	Mark D. Penk	A-6727	3301
5642	7590	08/09/2006	EXAMINER	
SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044			ENGLAND, DAVID E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/976,604	PENK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	David E. England	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 and 22-43 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 and 22-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DE

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 19 and 22 – 43 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 11 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the output transport stream identifier". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Claims 12 – 15 are rejected for their dependence on claim 11.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1 – 8, 33 – 36 and 39 – 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Teraoka U.S. Patent No. 6292836.
8. Referencing claim 33, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches an apparatus in a digital network that propagates a plurality of transport streams, the apparatus comprising:
  9. a port adapted to receive the plurality of transport streams, wherein each transport stream of the plurality of transport streams has a transport stream identifier associated therewith, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”); and
  10. a processor in communication with the input port, the processor adapted to monitor the transport stream identifier and respond to changes thereto by generating a network message, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”).
11. Referencing claim 34, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches the network message includes a second transport stream identifier, wherein the second transport stream identifier is the new transport stream identifier associated with the received transport stream, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”).

12. Referencing claim 35, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches the network message further includes a device identifier associated with the apparatus, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”).

13. Referencing claim 36, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches the network message is transmitted through the port, (e.g. col. 5, lines 1 – 11).

14. Referencing claim 39, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches a transmitter in communication with the processors the transmitter adapted to transmit a second transport stream that includes at least a portion of the received transport stream, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”); and

15. a second port adapted to receive and transmit messages, wherein the network message is transmitted through the second port, and the network message includes a device identifier associated with the apparatus, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”).

16. Referencing claim 40, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches the network message includes the current transport stream identifier associated with the received transport stream, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line

54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”).

17. Referencing claim 41, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches the second transport stream has a second transport stream identifier associated therewith, and the processor receives a remapping message from the second port and responds thereto by remapping the second transport stream identifier associated with the second transport stream, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”).

18. Referencing claim 42, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches the processor receives an initiate mapping message from the second port and responds thereto by sending through the second port a network message having a device identifier associated with the apparatus and the transport stream identifier included therein, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”).

19. Referencing claim 43, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches the processor receives an initiate mapping message from the port and responds thereto by sending through the port a network message having a device identifier associated with the apparatus and the transport stream identifier included therein, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-*

*B={VIP\_C, port\_C}" & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, "VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPAddr\_D").*

20. Claims 1 – 8 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Rao (6789118) in view of Teraoka (6292836).

23. Referencing claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao teaches a method of mapping a digital network that includes a plurality of devices that receive and transmit a plurality of transport streams, the method comprising the steps of:

24. grouping multiple devices of the plurality of devices into a plurality of tiers within the digital network, (e.g. col. 20, lines 24 – 40); and

25. associating a first particular device of a first tier with a second particular device of a second tier of the digital network, wherein the second particular device receives a plurality of

transport streams, each transmitted from the first particular device, (e.g. col. 20, lines 41 – 63), but does not specifically teach a corresponding unique transport stream with a transport stream ID. Teraoka teaches a transport stream with a corresponding unique transport stream ID, (e.g., col. 1, lines 29 – 55 & col. 6, lines 20 – 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Teraoka with Rao because utilizing a type of stream ID could aid in the differentiation between packets that traverse a router. Furthermore, it may also be used in case a packet is missing from transmission. If a packet is out of sequence then the correct sequence number that is attached to the packet will differentiate it from other packets.

26. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao (6789118) in view of Teraoka (6292836) in view of Brandt et al. (6377993) (hereinafter Brandt).

27. As per claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao teaches a method of mapping a digital network that includes a plurality of devices that receive and transmit a plurality of transport streams, the method comprising the steps of:

28. grouping multiple devices of the plurality of devices into a plurality of tiers within the digital network, (e.g. col. 20, lines 24 – 40); and

29. associating a first particular device of a first tier with a second particular device of a second tier of the digital network, wherein the second particular device receives a plurality of transport streams with transmitted from the first particular device, (e.g. col. 20, lines 41 – 63),

but does not specifically teach the plurality of tiers including a source tier, an intermediate tier, and an output tier, and

30. wherein the second particular device receives a plurality of transport streams with transport stream identifiers transmitted from the first particular device. Teraoka teaches a transport stream with a corresponding unique transport stream ID, (e.g., col. 1, lines 29 – 55 & col. 6, lines 20 – 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Teraoka with Rao because of similar reasons stated above.

31. Brandt teaches the plurality of tiers including a source tier, an intermediate tier, and an output tier, (e.g., col. 6, lines 18 – 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Brandt with the combine system of Rao and Teraoka because providing an intermediate tier could provide a secure web server and back end services to provide applications that establish user sessions, govern user authentication and their entitlements, and communicate with adaptor programs to simplify the interchange of data across the network.

32. Claims 11 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao and Teraoka as applied to claim 9 above, and in further view of Hegde (6570875).

33. As per claim 11, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao and Teraoka do not specifically teach prior to the step of grouping, further including the steps of:

34. transmitting an initiate mapping message to the plurality of devices; and

35. receiving a network message from each of the plurality of devices, each network message per device including an output transport stream identifier and a device identifier, wherein the output transport stream identifier is associated with a transport stream transmitted by a device associated with the device identifier.

36. Hegde teaches prior to the step of grouping, further including the steps of:

37. transmitting an initiate mapping message to the plurality of devices, (e.g. col. 8, lines 7 – 17); and

38. receiving a network message from each of the plurality of devices, each network message per device including an output transport stream identifier and a device identifier, wherein the output transport stream identifier is associated with a transport stream transmitted by a device associated with the device identifier, (e.g. col. 8, lines 18 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Hegde with the combine system of Rao and Teraoka because it would be more efficient for a system to set up links, port id and addresses to different groups when the system is powered on so updated information that is on the system can be transmitted to the device to ensure that any changes in the network are propagated throughout the network to ensure timely transmission of newly installed devices or transmitted information.

39. As per claim 12, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao and Teraoka do not specifically teach the step of grouping further includes the step of:

40. using the device identifier included in each of the network messages and a table to group the plurality of devices into tiers.

41. Hegde teaches the step of grouping further includes the step of:
42. using the device identifier included in each of the network messages and a table to group the plurality of devices into tiers, (e.g. col. 7, lines 15 – 26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Hegde with the combine system of Rao and Tokuyo because of similar reasons stated above. Furthermore, if there were a group of permanent users it would be advantageous to store the group of users in a table so to reference them if needed in a multicast transmission circumstance.
43. As per claim 13, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao each of the network messages further includes an input network stream identifier associated with a second transport stream, which is received by a device associated with the device identifier, (e.g. col. 20, lines 41 – 59).
44. As per claim 14, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao the input network stream identifier includes a network transport stream source indicator, (e.g. col. 20, lines 41 – 59).
45. As per claim 15, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao the network transport stream source indicator is a predetermined value for a device that is a source of a network transport stream in the digital network, (e.g. col. 20, lines 41 – 59).
46. As per claim 16, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao and Hegde do not specifically teach determining whether a particular transport stream identifier associated with a

particular transport stream of a plurality of transport streams transmitted from a particular device of the multiple devices of a given tier is the same as one or more transport stream identifiers associated with other transport streams transmitted from one or more devices of the multiple devices of the given tier;

47. responsive to determining the particular transport stream identifier is not the same, associating the particular device with the particular transport stream identifier;

48. responsive to determining the particular transport stream identifier is the same, further including the steps of:

49. determining a new transport stream identifier for the particular transport stream, wherein the new transport stream identifier is different from other transport stream identifiers associated with transport streams transmitted from the multiple devices of the given tier;

50. transmitting a remap message to the particular device, wherein the particular device responds thereto by remapping the particular transport stream identifier associated with the particular transport stream to the new transport stream identifier; and

51. associating the particular device with the new transport stream identifier.

52. Teraoka teaches determining whether a particular transport stream identifier associated with a particular transport stream of a plurality of transport streams transmitted from a particular device of the multiple devices of a given tier is the same as one or more transport stream identifiers associated with other transport streams transmitted from one or more devices of the multiple devices of the given tier, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35);

Art Unit: 2143

53. responsive to determining the particular transport stream identifier is not the same, associating the particular device with the particular transport stream identifier, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35);

54. responsive to determining the particular transport stream identifier is the same, further including the steps of:

55. determining a new transport stream identifier for the particular transport stream, wherein the new transport stream identifier is different from other transport stream identifiers associated with transport streams transmitted from the multiple devices of the given tier, (e.g. col. 5, line 45 – col. 6, line 2);

56. transmitting a remap message to the particular device, wherein the particular device responds thereto by remapping the particular transport stream identifier associated with the particular transport stream to the new transport stream identifier, (e.g. col. 6, line 56 – col. 7, line 8); and

57. associating the particular device with the new transport stream identifier, (e.g. col. 6, line 56 – col. 7, line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Teraoka with the combine systems of Rao and Hegde because remapping a message with a different transport stream identifier would ensure that no duplications in identifiers are given out to different system. Doing so would aid in miss-transmission of information to devices that did not request said information.

58. As per claim 17, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao and Hegde do not specifically teach after the step of transmitting the remap message, further including the step of:

Art Unit: 2143

59. receiving another network message from a second particular device, wherein the second particular device receives the particular transport stream transmitted from the first particular device. Teraoka teaches after the step of transmitting the remap message, further including the step of:

60. receiving another network message from a second particular device, wherein the second particular device receives the particular transport stream transmitted from the first particular device, (e.g. col. 6, line 56 – col. 7, line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Teraoka with the combine systems of Rao and Hegde because it would be more efficient for a system to reestablish communication with other network devices so the transfer of addresses and port numbers can be propagated throughout the network.

61. As per claim 18, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao and Hegde do not specifically teach the second particular device sends the other network message responsive to the first particular device remapping the particular transport stream identifier associated with the particular transport stream. Teraoka teaches the second particular device sends the other network message responsive to the first particular device remapping the particular transport stream identifier associated with the particular transport stream, (e.g. col. 6, line 56 – col. 7, line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Teraoka with the combine systems of Rao and Hegde because of similar reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

62. As per claim 19, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Rao teaches associating the particular device with at least one input transport stream identifier, wherein the network message from the particular device includes the at least one transport stream identifier, which is associated with the at least one transport stream received in the particular device, (e.g. col. 20, lines 41 – 59).

63. Claims 22 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tokuyo et al. (6829238) (hereinafter Tokuyo) in view of Rao (6789118).

64. Referencing claim 22, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Tokuyo teaches a method of mapping a digital network, the method comprising:

65. assigning a unique transport stream identifier to each transport stream of a plurality of transport streams, wherein the plurality of transport streams are transmitted from a plurality of devices included in the digital network and wherein each device of the plurality of devices transmits a plurality of transport streams, (e.g. col. 4, lines 15 – 37, “*...assigns a unique identification number to the TCP...*” & col. 6, lines 5 – 26, “*IP packet, source and destination IP address, port number, unique identification number*”);

66. associating each assigned unique transport stream identifier with a particular device of the plurality of devices, wherein the particular device transmits the transport stream having the unique transport stream identifier assigned thereto, (e.g. col. 4, lines 15 – 37, “*...assigns a unique identification number to the TCP...*” & col. 6, lines 5 – 26, “*IP packet, source and destination IP address, port number, unique identification number*”);

67. transmitting to each device of the plurality of devices an assigned unique transport stream identifier associated therewith, (e.g. col. 4, lines 15 – 37, “*...assigns a unique identification number to the TCP...*” & col. 6, lines 5 – 26, “*IP packet, source and destination IP address, port number, unique identification number*”);

68. receiving a network message from multiple devices of the plurality of devices, each network message including at least one input transport stream identifier, (e.g. col. 6, lines 5 – 26, “*IP packet, source and destination IP address, port number, unique identification number*”); but does not specifically teach using the multiple network messages to determine a hierarchy of devices for the plurality devices.

69. Rao teaches using the multiple network messages to determine a hierarchy of devices for the plurality devices, (e.g. col. 16, lines 24 – 48, “*User 1 has QoA level of one, User 2 has a QoA level of two, and User 3 has a QoA level of three.*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Rao with Tokuyo because it would be more efficient for the higher level users that system’s assigned QoA be serviced first so there higher level information can be processed in a timely manner.

70. As per claim 23, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Tokuyo teaches the at least one input transport stream identifier is one of the unique transport stream identifiers, (e.g. col. 4, lines 15 – 37, “*...assigns a unique identification number to the TCP...*” & col. 6, lines 5 – 26, “*IP packet, source and destination IP address, port number, unique identification number*”).

Art Unit: 2143

71. As per claim 24, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Tokuyo teaches the step of using the multiple network messages further includes the step of:

72. associating a first device of the plurality of devices with a second device of the multiple devices, wherein the at least one input transport stream identifier of the network message from the second device includes at least one unique transport stream identifier associated with the first device, (e.g. col. 7, line 59 – 4, “*src-IP, src-port number, dst-IP, dst-port number*” & col. 8, lines 34 – 49).

73. Claims 25 – 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tokuyo and Rao as applied to claim 22 above, and in further view of Teraoka (6292836).

74. As per claim 25, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Tokuyo and Rao do not specifically teach prior to the step of assigning, receiving a second network message from the plurality of devices, each second network message per device including an output transport stream identifier. Teraoka teaches prior to the step of assigning, receiving a second network message from the plurality of devices, each second network message per device including an output transport stream identifier, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Teraoka with the combine system of Tokuyo and Rao because it would be more convenient for a first device in a network to have the ability to

move from one location to another while continual connection with a second device that the first device was communicating with, while having this process be transparent to both users.

75. As per claim 26, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Tokuyo and Rao do not specifically teach the step of assigning further includes the step of:

76. using the output transport stream identifier included in each second network message from the plurality of devices to assign the unique transport stream identifier.

77. Teraoka teaches the step of assigning further includes the step of:

78. using the output transport stream identifier included in each second network message from the plurality of devices to assign the unique transport stream identifier, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPAddr\_D*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Teraoka with the combine system of Tokuyo and Rao because of similar reasons stated above.

79. As per claim 27, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Tokuyo teaches sending a mapping initiation message to a second plurality of devices included in the digital network, wherein the second plurality of devices includes the first plurality of devices, and each of the first plurality of devices respond to the mapping initiation message by sending the second network message, (e.g. col. 4, lines 15 – 37, “*...assigns a unique identification number to the TCP...*” & col. 6, lines 5 – 26, “*IP packet, source and destination IP address, port number, unique identification number*”), but does not specifically teach prior to the step of receiving the

second network message, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35, “*VendPointAddr-B={VIP\_C, port\_C}*” & col. 6, line 54 – col. 7, line 8, “*VIP address of computer C=VIPaddr\_C, IP address of computer C=IPaddr\_D*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Teraoka with the combine system of Tokuyo and Rao because it would be more efficient for a system to have a layout of the system it would be traversing in the network so the information that is being sent is received at its destination with the least hops and/or failures encountered.

80. As per claim 28, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Tokuyo does not specifically teach determining whether the first plurality of devices is the same as the second plurality of devices; and

81. responsive to determining the first plurality of devices is not the same as the second plurality of devices, generating an alert message.

82. Rao teaches determining whether the first plurality of devices is the same as the second plurality of devices, (e.g. col. 20, lines 41 – 59); and

83. responsive to determining the first plurality of devices is not the same as the second plurality of devices, generating an alert message, (e.g. col. 20, lines 3 – 13 & 41 – 59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Teraoka with the combine system of Tokuyo and Rao because it would be more secure if the system only gave specific access and privileges to users of a specific network. Also in doing so could block out potential invaders to a system.

84. Claims 29 – 32 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

85. Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka as applied to claim 33 above, and in view of Rao (6789118).

86. As per claim 37, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka does not specifically teach the port is a plurality of input ports, each input port of the plurality of input ports receiving at least one transport stream having a transport stream identifier associated therewith, and the processor is adapted to monitor the transport stream identifier of each input transport stream and respond to changes thereto by generating the network message.

87. Rao teaches the port is a plurality of input ports, each input port of the plurality of input ports receiving at least one transport stream having a transport stream identifier associated therewith, and the processor is adapted to monitor the transport stream identifier of each input transport stream and respond to changes thereto by generating the network message, (e.g. col. 24, lines 18 – 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was conceived to combine Rao with Teraoka because if ports have the same identification number, errors in a system would occur because of the systems inability to differentiating between a plurality of ports in a system. Assigning a plurality of ports different identification numbers would make for a more efficient system that does not encounter errors because of similar port identification numbers.

88. As per claim 38, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Teraoka teaches the network message includes the current transport stream identifier associated with each of the received input transport streams, (e.g. col. 6, lines 20 – 35).

***Response to Arguments***

89. Applicant's arguments filed 04/26/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

90. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Teraoka discusses the introduction of a connection defined by end points having identifiers VEndPointID and VendPointAddr (see col. 4, lines 48 – 67). These identifiers refer to the VIP address of a computer that generates a VTCP connection end point and a port number in effect when the VTCP connection end point was generated, respectively. However, Teraoka fails to disclose a controller that is adapted to generate a transport stream map as claimed in claim 1.

91. As to the first Remark, Examiner would like to point out that nowhere in the Applicant's claim language is it specifically defined as to what would constitute a controller or a transport stream map. Therefore, the prior art reads on the Examiner's interpretation of the broad claim language.

92. Furthermore, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

93. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Teraoka fails to disclose the devices receive a plurality of transport streams with transport stream identifiers. Instead, Teraoka uses identifiers for VIP addresses and port number. Identifiers for VIP addresses and port number are not the same as identifiers for transport streams.

94. As to the second Remark, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Applicant is suggested to state how they are different instead of simply stating that they VIP addresses and port number aren't the same as what is claimed. Furthermore, the responses to the above remarks also apply therein out.

95. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Teraoka does not teach each transport stream of the plurality of transport streams has a transport stream identifier and monitor the transport stream identifier and respond to changes thereto associated therewith. Teraoka actually discloses that when VEndPoint\_B is moved from one computer to another VEndPointID\_B remains unchanged and VEndPointAddr\_B is changed. However, an end point address identifier is not the same as the transport stream identifier as claimed.

96. As to the third Remark, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Furthermore, the responses to the above remarks also apply therein out.

97. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Teraoka, Rao, Brandt, Hegde and Tokuyo are silent regarding identifiers, particularly transport stream identifiers. Clearly, a VPN ID is not the same thing as a transport stream ID as claimed.

98. As to the forth Remark, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Furthermore, the responses to the above remarks also apply therein out.

99. In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that that Teraoka, Rao, Brandt, Hegde and Tokuyo are silent regarding the claim limitations of, a plurality of transport streams with transport stream identifiers, mapping a digital network, and the limitations of claim 22.

100. As to the fifth Remark, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Furthermore, the responses to the above remarks also apply therein out.

### *Conclusion*

101. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

DE 